

**PROPOSED REMARKS****Canceled Claims**

Applicants propose canceling claims 22-24 without prejudice.

**Cited References**

Applicants respectfully submit that the *Hluchyj* reference fails to provide support that its source 102 could be interpreted as a switching point, and thus could not be a switching point to receive a message to indicate congestion. Figure 1 includes "edge node 104," which is specifically labeled as being associated with the source. Showing an edge node associated with source 102 infers that source 102 is outside of the network over which its packets will be switched. Because source 102 is outside the network, Applicants submit it cannot be a switching point for packets, which receives and forwards packets over the network. The claims in contrast recite a switching point.

**PROPOSED  
RESPONSE**

Application No.: 09/189,819  
Attorney Docket No.: 002717.P033

-4-

Examiner: P. Tran  
Art Unit: 2666